

No Death Star – For Now

Jay A. Frogel and Andrew Gould¹

Department of Astronomy, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210

frogel@astronomy.ohio-state.edu, gould@astronomy.ohio-state.edu

Abstract

A star passing within $\sim 10^4$ AU of the Sun would trigger a comet shower that would reach the inner solar system about 0.18 Myr later. We calculate a prior probability of $\sim 0.4\%$ that a star has passed this close to the Sun but that the comet shower has not yet reached the Earth. We search the HIPPARCOS catalog for such recent close-encounter candidates and, in agreement with García-Sánchez et al. (1997), find none. The new result reported in this *Letter* is an estimation of the completeness of the search. Because of the relatively bright completeness limit of the catalog itself, $V \sim 8$, the search is sensitive to only about half the stars that could have had such a near encounter. On the other hand, we show that the search is sensitive to nearly all of the *past* encounters that would lead to a *major* shower in the *future* and conclude that it is highly unlikely that one will occur during the next 0.5 Myr.

Subject Headings: astrometry – comets: general – stars: kinematics

¹ Alfred P. Sloan Foundation Fellow

1. Introduction

Although most new long-period comets that enter the inner solar system have semi-major axes $a \gtrsim 2 \times 10^4$ AU, simulations show that the same scattering processes responsible for creating the reservoir of these comets (the “Oort Cloud”) also generated a region with a much higher density of comets at 3×10^3 AU $\lesssim a \lesssim 2 \times 10^4$ AU, (Hills 1981; Duncan, Quinn, & Tremaine 1987). When a star has an impact parameter $b \sim 10^4$ AU, and so passes directly through this much more densely populated inner Oort Cloud, the number of new comets entering the inner solar system can then increase by up to 40-fold for ~ 3 Myr until interactions with planets again clear the loss cone (Duncan et al. 1987, but also see Weissman 1996a,b, 1997). Such a comet shower might result in a large increase in impact frequency on Earth; these multiple impacts over a relatively short time interval could cause stepwise mass extinctions of life (Hut et al. 1987). Such violent encounters occur rarely, at average intervals

$$t_i \sim (\pi b^2 n \bar{v})^{-1} \sim 45 \text{ Myr} \quad (1.1)$$

where $n \sim 7.4 \times 10^{-2} \text{ pc}^{-3}$ is the local density of stars (Gould, Bahcall, & Flynn 1996, 1997; Wielen, Jahreiss, & Krüger 1983; Liebert, Dahn, & Monet 1988), and $\bar{v} \sim 38 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ is the mean speed of the Sun relative to passing stars. Thus, of order half of all new comets (and hence half of catastrophic cometary impacts on Earth) occur in a steady drizzle while the other half occur during brief 3 Myr episodes triggered by the rare passage of a “death star”.

The present epoch is one of steady drizzle (Weissman 1993, 1996b). It is possible, however, that a death star has already passed close to the Sun and that a comet shower will commence in the near future. When a star passes the Sun at $b \sim 10^4$ AU, the perturbed comets (with $a \sim b/2$) do not reach the Earth until after a delay time

$$t_d = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{a}{\text{AU}} \right)^{3/2} \text{ yr} \sim 0.18 \text{ Myr}. \quad (1.2)$$

Hence, there is a small, but non-negligible chance, $t_d/t_i \sim 0.4\%$ that a death star has already passed the Sun but its rain of death and destruction has not yet begun.

One could easily test for this possibility if accurate distances, d , proper motions μ , and radial velocities, v_r , were available for all nearby stars. For close encounters, $b \ll d$, the impact parameter is given by

$$b = \frac{\mu d^2}{v_r}. \quad (1.3)$$

Unfortunately, no such complete inventory is available. However, the HIPPARCOS

satellite does provide accurate distances and proper motions for a stellar sample that is nearly complete to $V = 8$. In § 2 we search for death star candidates in the HIPPARCOS sample. García-Sánchez et al. (1997) have conducted a similar search and found one star that may encounter the Sun about 1 Myr in the future. Mülläri & Orlov (1996) have also conducted such searches with pre-HIPPARCOS data and identified some of the same stars as candidates for close encounters. What is new about the present study is that we evaluate the completeness of our search (§ 3) for stars that recently passed close to the Sun (or are about to do so) and, more importantly, the completeness for recent encounters that could lead to a major comet shower in the “near” future. In § 5, we rule out such a major shower at the 96% confidence level.

2. Death Star Search

The HIPPARCOS catalog (ESA 1997) is virtually complete for $V < 7.3$ and is $\sim 70\%$ complete at $V = 8$. For $V > 8$, the completeness drops rapidly, particularly for death star candidates. Among the numerous stars at $V \sim 10$, only the nearby ones could have recently passed the Sun. The primary method for identifying nearby stars is from their high proper motion, whereas a death star is characterized precisely by its *low* proper motion and so would escape this selection technique and would most likely not be included in the HIPPARCOS catalogue. We therefore restrict our primary search to stars $V \leq V_{\max} = 8$. Next, we restrict attention to close encounters, with impact parameters $b < b_{\max} = 0.05 \text{ pc}$ (10^4 AU), thus ensuring passage through the inner Oort Cloud.

Equation (1.3) can be then be rewritten $\mu < b_{\max} v_r / d^2$. We assume that $v_r < v_{\max} = 150 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, based on the following considerations. First, it includes all disk stars and virtually all thick disk stars (see § 3). While this will exclude most spheroid stars, these comprise only $\sim 0.2\%$ of main-sequence stars in the solar neighborhood (Gould, Flynn, & Bahcall 1998). Even taking account of their higher speed, they comprise only $\sim 1\%$ of the flux of nearby stars. Second, with this limit, we need to search for stars only within a distance

$$d < d_{\max} = v_{\max} t_d = 27 \text{ pc} \quad (2.1)$$

from the Sun. At this limiting distance, it is necessary to evaluate whether the star’s proper motion satisfies $\mu < b_{\max} / (v_{\max} t_d^2) = 2 \text{ mas yr}^{-1}$. This is already close to the size of the HIPPARCOS errors. A doubling of $v_{\max}$, would necessitate a search to twice the distance where the expected proper motions would be only half as big. Hence, any detected candidates would be of marginal significance.

Thus, our search is restricted by

$$V_{\max} = 8, \quad d_{\max} = 27 \text{ pc}, \quad v_{\max} = 150 \text{ km s}^{-1}, \quad b_{\max} = 0.05 \text{ pc}. \quad (2.2)$$

For the 753 HIPPARCOS stars that satisfy the first two conditions in equation (2.2), parallax errors are generally only a few percent. However, proper motion errors can be a large fraction of the allowable proper motion,

$$\mu < \mu_{\max}(d) = \frac{b_{\max} v_{\max}}{d^2} = 15.8 \left(\frac{d}{10 \text{ pc}} \right)^{-2} \text{ mas yr}^{-1}. \quad (2.3)$$

In order to allow for proper-motion errors, we adopt a lower-limit estimate $\mu_{\text{low}}^2 = (\max\{0, |\mu_\alpha| - 1.5\sigma_\alpha\})^2 + (\max\{0, |\mu_\delta| - 1.5\sigma_\delta\})^2$, where μ_α and μ_δ are the two components of the proper motion, and σ_α and σ_δ are their errors. This search yields two candidates, HIPPARCOS 24502 and 35550. However, both of these stars are among the handful (17 out of the 753 or 2%) with proper-motion errors exceeding 5 mas yr^{-1} in at least one direction. Indeed their errors (in mas yr^{-1}) are (23.72, 12.19) and (11.31, 5.00) respectively. Elimination of these 17 stars leaves no candidates that satisfy our search criteria.

HIPPARCOS proper motions are relative to a non-rotating frame. Hence, there are no Coriolis force corrections to our analysis. However, Galactic tides will cause the impact parameter to deviate from equation (1.3) by

$|\Delta \mathbf{b}| \simeq (\pi/3) G \rho t^2 d |\sin(2b_g)|$ where ρ is the local disk density, $t = d/v_r$, and b_g is the Galactic latitude of the passing star. For relevant parameters ($\rho \sim 0.1 M_\odot \text{ pc}^{-3}$, $t < 0.5 \text{ Myr}$, $d < 27 \text{ pc}$), $|\Delta \mathbf{b}| < 700 \text{ AU}$ which can be ignored.

3. Completeness of the Basic Search

Suppose that a death star had passed the Sun during the past $t_d = 0.18 \text{ Myr}$. What is the probability that we would have detected it in our search of the HIPPARCOS catalog? We first construct a luminosity function of dwarf stars by combining the data from Wielen et al. (1983) for $4 \leq M_V \leq 10$ and from Gould et al. (1997) for $11 \leq M_V \leq 18$. Note that the latter is uncorrected for binaries which is what is desired in the present context because the overwhelming majority of binaries are close enough that they would act like single-star perturbers. We obtain a luminosity function in units of $10^{-3} \text{ pc}^{-3} \text{ mag}^{-1}$ over the range $4 \leq M_V \leq 18$ of $\Phi = (2.3, 3.3, 4.0, 3.0, 4.0, 4.6, 7.1, 9.5, 10.1, 6.3, 3.9, 1.9, 1.7, 2.3, 2.3)$. A rigorous treatment of brighter stars, $M_V < 4$, would be complicated; but since their relative number is small, we use an approximate treatment. Main-sequence stars brighter than $M_V = -0.6$ can be ignored since there are none within $d_{\max} = 27 \text{ pc}$

of the Sun. For the remaining early-type stars, we adopt a total number density of $3 \times 10^{-3} \text{ pc}^{-3}$, and assume that their velocity distribution is like that of other disk stars, but without a thick-disk component. The total main-sequence number density is then $n_{ms} \sim 69 \times 10^{-3} \text{ pc}^{-3}$. The number density of giants ($M_V < 2.2$) is $n_g = 2 \times 10^{-3} \text{ pc}^{-3}$ (C. Flynn 1998, private communication) and that of white dwarfs is $n_{wd} \sim 3 \times 10^{-3} \text{ pc}^{-3}$ (Liebert et al. 1988). Hence, the total number density is $n = 74 \times 10^{-3} \text{ pc}^{-3}$.

To evaluate the completeness we perform the following Monte Carlo simulation. First, we model the local stellar population as composed 90% of disk stars with mean velocity relative to the Sun in Galactic coordinates of $(9, 20, 7) \text{ km s}^{-1}$ and with dispersions $(38, 19, 20) \text{ km s}^{-1}$ and 10% of thick disk stars with mean velocity $(9, 62, 7) \text{ km s}^{-1}$ and with dispersions $(66, 37, 38) \text{ km s}^{-1}$ (Casertano, Ratnatunga, & Bahcall 1990). We begin the Monte Carlo by drawing a stellar velocity randomly from this distribution. Next, we choose a random position on the sky and calculate v_r . Then we choose b^2 randomly from the interval $[0, b_{\text{max}}^2]$. If $bv_r > b_{\text{max}}v_{\text{max}}$ then the star would not be included in our sample even though $b < b_{\text{max}}$. Otherwise we perform the following calculation for each apparent magnitude. First we find d_{lim} , the limiting distance to which the star could be detected. This is the lesser of $d_{\text{max}} = 27 \text{ pc}$ (the distance limit of the study) and the distance at which the star's apparent magnitude would rise above $V_{\text{max}} = 8$ (the magnitude limit). At this limiting distance, the elapsed time since closest approach to the Sun is $t_{\text{lim}} = d_{\text{lim}}/v_r$. If $t_d < t_{\text{lim}}$, then the star is always detected. Otherwise it is detected only if the passage is sufficiently recent, that is a fraction t_{lim}/t_d of the time. Each simulated event is weighted by $|v_r|$ since the flux of encounters is proportional to the relative velocity.

Essentially all encounters of stars $M_V < 6$ are detected, so the details of the luminosity functions for giants and early main sequence stars are not important; only their total number density. White dwarfs are all assigned a magnitude $M_V = 15$ and, of course, very few ($\sim 6\%$) are detected.

Because the underlying catalog is complete to $V = 7.3$ and only 70% complete at $V = 8$, we repeat the entire calculation with $V_{\text{max}} = 7.3$ and take as our final result the average of the two calculations weighted 70:30. Figure 1 shows the completeness as a function of absolute magnitude. The completeness for the stellar population as a whole is 53%. Taking account of the fact that we are insensitive to most spheroidal stars and that we eliminated 2% of the stars because of the poor precision of their proper motions, this estimate is reduced to 51%.

Of course there is no hard boundary at $b = 0.05 \text{ pc}$ separating catastrophic encounters from more benign ones. One might then ask how sensitive we are to encounters at somewhat larger impact parameters. To answer this question, we

increase $b_{\max}$ by a factor 2 to 0.1 pc. Correspondingly, we increase t_d by $2^{3/2}$ to 0.5 Myr. We then repeat the same completeness calculation and find 34%. After again taking account of insensitivity to spheroid stars and the poor-precision stars, this is reduced to 33%.

4. A Candidate

In order to evaluate the completeness of our study, we imposed a magnitude limit $V < 8$. Nevertheless, it is of interest to ask whether any of the stars in the HIPPARCOS catalog with $V > 8$ are death star candidates. We therefore ran our search on the entire catalog (but excluding stars with proper-motion errors exceeding 5 mas yr^{-2}) and found only one candidate: HIPPARCOS 89825 (Gl 710) the same star found by García-Sánchez et al. (1997). Since Gl 710's $v_r = -14.3 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ (Stauffer & Hartman 1986), its rendezvous with the Sun is in the future, not the past. The impact parameter is $b = 0.33 \pm 0.15 \text{ pc}$. Thus, in about 1.3 Myr, this star will have a close encounter with the Sun. Weissman et al. (1997) estimate that this will cause a (probably not significant) increase of 50% in the long-period comet flux.

5. Sensitivity to High-Damage Encounters

As we discussed in § 3, our search is sensitive to only slightly more than half of all potential encounters. It is much more sensitive to brighter (generally more massive) stars for which the search is essentially complete. Among the fainter stars for which it is not complete, it is more sensitive to slower-moving stars. Up to this point, we have considered all potential perturbers as equals. In fact, the stars to which our search is most sensitive are also potentially the most dangerous.

To understand why, we first review the Duncan et al. (1987) picture of how a shower is initiated. During normal times, the action of the planets depletes comet phase space of all orbits with perihelions $q < a_{\text{nep}}$, where $a_{\text{nep}} = 30 \text{ AU}$ is the orbital radius of Neptune. The most severe encounter possible, one where this loss cone is suddenly filled, increases the new-comet rate by a factor ~ 40 . (Duncan et al. 1987 give this factor as 20, but we amend their calculation in the appendix by taking into account more recent work.) If the loss cone is only partially filled, then the increase in the new-comet rate would be smaller. To fill the loss cone requires changing the specific angular momentum of the comet by $\Delta J = (2GM_{\odot}a_{\text{nep}})^{1/2}$. For a comet whose aphelion is near the impact parameter b of the passing star, this requires a change in velocity $\Delta v \gtrsim \Delta J/b$ (note that Weissman 1996b finds that shower comets come from the *entire* Oort Cloud rather than primarily those with

aphelia close to that of the impact parameter). On the other hand, the velocity change induced by the star on the comet is $\Delta v = 2GM_*/(b_c v_*)$ where M_* is the mass of the star, v_* is its speed relative to the Sun, and b_c is its impact parameter relative to the comet. This means that the effective radius of action of the passing star is

$$b_c \lesssim f_* b, \quad f_* \equiv 2^{1/2} \frac{v_{\text{nep}}}{v_*} \frac{M_*}{M_\odot}, \quad (5.1)$$

where $v_{\text{nep}} = 5.5 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ is the orbital speed of Neptune. Hence, it is only stars that are of order the mass of the Sun and are moving relatively slowly that can fill most of the loss cone.

To quantify our sensitivity to the most damaging encounters, we define a damage parameter, Q ,

$$Q \equiv (\min\{1, f_*\})^2. \quad (5.2)$$

From equation (5.1), it is clear that Q is a rough estimate of the fraction of the loss cone that is filled. We estimate the masses of main-sequence stars using the empirical mass-luminosity relation of Henry & McCarthy (1993). White dwarfs are assumed to have a mass $M = 0.6 M_\odot$ and giants to have $M = 1 M_\odot$.

We evaluate Q for each simulated event in our Monte Carlo calculation. We find for stars passing within $b_{\text{max}} = 0.05 \text{ pc}$ of the Sun within the last $t_d = 0.18 \text{ Myr}$, that only 3% of events have $Q > 0.5$ (of which half have $Q = 1$), but we detect 99% of these. An additional 8% have $0.1 < Q < 0.5$ of which we detect 98%. Another 29% have $0.005 < Q < 0.1$ of which we detect 90%. It is overwhelmingly the encounters with very little effect ($Q < 0.005$) that escape notice. These comprise 60% of all events, only 29% of which are detected. If we define a major shower as $Q > 0.1$, then we would detect 98% of stars generating such a shower. Taking account of the fact that we have eliminated 2% of the stars because of poor proper-motion measurements, we still would detect 96%.

The situation is similar for the less dangerous class of events studied in § 3, passing within $b_{\text{max}} = 0.1 \text{ pc}$ of the Sun during the last $t_d = 0.5 \text{ Myr}$. Again, 3% have $Q > 0.5$ of which we detect 98%, 8% have $0.1 < Q < 0.5$ of which we detect 94%, and 29% have $0.005 < Q < 0.1$ of which we detect 65%. The main loss of sensitivity relative to the $b_{\text{max}} = 0.05 \text{ pc}$ case comes from the 60% with $Q < 0.005$. For these, our sensitivity drops to 11%. Note that this “less dangerous” class of events also includes all of the “more dangerous” ($b < 0.05 \text{ pc}$) events occurring up to 0.5 Myr into the future.

Thus, while it is possible that a close encounter has occurred recently enough to initiate a comet shower that has not yet arrived, any such shower will almost

certainly be a weak one. Moreover, it is almost equally unlikely that a major shower will occur in the next 0.5 Myr.

This conclusion may seem a bit too reassuring in view of the fact that in § 3 we (and García-Sánchez et al. 1997) reported a possible *future* encounter with a star which has $V = 9.66$ and so is beyond the magnitude limit of our basic study. This star has an estimated mass $M \sim 0.64 M_\odot$ and hence a damage parameter $Q \sim 0.12$. That is, it is inside the regime where we claimed to have 98% sensitivity to *past* $b_{\max} = 0.05$ pc events. If the sign of the radial velocity had been reversed, couldn't this star have precipitated a future comet shower but (being fainter than the magnitude limit) escaped detection? The answer is no. It would have passed the Sun 1.3 Myr ago and so, if it had precipitated a shower, this shower would have reached the Earth more than 1 Myr ago.

Acknowledgements: We thank M. Duncan, G. Newsom, and P. Popowski for stimulating discussions and S. Tremaine for useful comments. The detailed comments by P. Weissman on an earlier version of this *Letter* were particularly helpful. Work by AG was supported in part by grant AST 94-20746 from the NSF.

APPENDIX Normalization of Shower Intensity

The dynamical simulations by Duncan et al. (1987) determine the density profile, $\rho(r)$, of the Oort Cloud, but not its normalization, k . Once the density profile is fixed the maximum absolute intensity of a comet shower, I_{shower} , (when a disturbance completely fills the loss cone in the inner Oort Cloud) is set by the normalization, $I_{\text{shower}} \propto k$. Similarly, for a fixed profile, the steady-state rate of new comets, I_{steady} , is proportional to the product of the normalization and the inverse time scale, ω , for comets to diffuse from the Oort Cloud into the loss cone, $I_{\text{steady}} \propto k\omega$. Hence $I_{\text{shower}}/I_{\text{steady}} \propto \omega^{-1}$. This time scale ω^{-1} is estimated theoretically, either analytically or from simulations. The inverse time scale is the sum of inverse time scales from all relevant processes. Duncan et al. (1987) argue that two such processes dominate, long range encounters from stars and Galactic tides, $\omega = \omega_* + \omega_g$. They show that $\omega_* = C\rho_*$ and $\omega_g = 0.47C\rho_0$, where ρ_* is the local density of stars, ρ_0 is the total local density of the disk, and C is a constant. Hence, $I_{\text{shower}}/I_{\text{steady}} \propto (\rho_* + 0.47\rho_0)^{-1}$. They adopted $\rho_0 = 0.185 M_\odot \text{pc}^{-3}$ (Bahcall 1984) and $\rho_* = 0.05 M_\odot \text{pc}^{-3}$. Recent star counts show that there are far fewer M dwarfs than previously believed, for a revised estimate of $\rho_* \sim 0.035 M_\odot \text{pc}^{-3}$. Also, Crézé et al. (1998) have recently made a purely *local* measurement of the mass density using accurate distances and proper motions from HIPPARCOS. They find $\rho_0 = 0.076 \pm 0.015 M_\odot \text{pc}^{-3}$. If these two newer values are used in place of Duncan et al.'s (1987), the ratio $I_{\text{shower}}/I_{\text{steady}}$ rises by a factor ~ 2 , from 20 to 40.

REFERENCES

1. Bahcall, J. N. 1984, ApJ, 276, 169
2. Duncan, M., Quinn, T., & Tremaine, S. 1987, AJ, 94, 1330
3. Casertano, S., Ratnatunga, K. U., & Bahcall, J. N. 1990, ApJ, 357, 435
4. Cr    , M., Chereulinst, E., Bienaym  , O., & Pichoninst, C. 1998, A&A, 329,920
5. ESA 1997, The HIPPARCOS Catalogue, ESA SP-1200
6. Garc    a-S    nchez, J., Preston, R. A., Jones, D. L., Weissman, P. R., Lestrade, J.-F., Latham, D. W., & Stefanik, R. P. 1997, HIPPARCOS Venice '97 Symposium, ESA SP-402, 617
7. Gould, A., Bahcall, J. N., & Flynn, C. 1996, ApJ, 465, 759
8. Gould, A., Bahcall, J. N., & Flynn, C. 1997, ApJ, 482, 913
9. Gould, A., Flynn, C., & Bahcall, J. N. 1998, ApJ, submitted
10. Henry, T. J. & McCarthy, D. W. 1993, AJ, 106, 773
11. Hills, J. G. 1981, AJ, 86, 1730
12. Hut, P., Alvarez, A., Elder, W. P., Hansen, T., Kauffman, E. G., Keller, G., Shoemaker, E. M., & Weissman, P. R. 1987, Nature, 329, 118
13. Liebert, J., Dahn, C. C., & Monet, D. G. 1988, ApJ, 332, 891
14. M      ri, A. A., & Orlov, V. V. 1996, Earth, Moon, and Planets, 72, 19
15. Stauffer, J. R., & Hartmann, L. W. ApJS, 1986, 61, 531
16. Weissman, P. R. 1993, BAAS, 25, 1063
17. Weissman, P. R. 1996a, in Completeing the Inventory of the Solar System, ASP Conference Series, 107, 265
18. Weissman, P. R. 1996b, Earth, Moon, and Planets, 72, 25
19. Weissman, P. R. 1997, in Near-Earth Objects, ed. J. L. Remo, Annals of the NY Academy of Science, 822, 67
20. Weissman, P. R., Garc    a-S    nchez, J., Preston, R. A., Jones, D. L., Lestrade, J.-F., & Latham, D. W. 1997, BAAS, 29, 1019
21. Wielen, R., Jahreiss, H., & Kr    ger, R. 1983, IAU Coll. 76: Nearby Stars and the Stellar Luminosity Function, A. G. D. Philip and A. R. Upgren eds., p 163

FIGURE CAPTIONS

- 1) Percentage of all close encounters in the Monte Carlo simulation as a function of stellar type. The three bars to the left represent white dwarfs, giants, and early main-sequence stars ($M_V < 4$). The 15 bars to the right represent one magnitude bins of the main-sequence luminosity function. The height of each bar is the percentage of all close encounters due to that type of star. The black portion of the bar represents the fraction of these events that would have been detected in our search of the HIPPARCOS catalog.

